Region		Project Name								
SR	MP Limit	S	L Number	Contract Num	mber PS&E		Number	PIN Number(s)	WIN Number	Federal Aid Number
SEPA (e.g	., EIS 1/1/99)		NEPA (e.g., CE 1/1/99)				Route Typ	e (e.g., NHS)		Project Type (e.g., P1)
Final Design Decisions Approval Date By Whom with Title							Final Sumi	mary Approval Date		By Whom with Title
Advertisen	Advertisement Date Reviewers									
REVIEW IT		T FILE COMPON	ENTS - 330.04		Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A		REMA	RKS
Is copy of design approval in the project file?										
2. Are the VE Study Workbook and VE Decision Document in the file?			file?							
3. Are required evaluate upgrades (EU) documented in the file?										
4. Are all design deviations documented in the file?										
5. Is Design Variance Inventory in the file?										
6. Is cost estimate in the file?										
7. Is the work zone traffic control strategy (WZTCS) documented in the file?				in the file?						
Additiona	Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space is necessary):									

Design Review Check List

June 16, 1999

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
A. ACCIDENT HISTORY				
Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐				
1. Is accident history in the file?				
			Ш	
Was accident history analyzed, and are conclusions documented in the file?				
2. Was accident history analyzed, and are conclusions documented in the life?		П		
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space i	s nece	ssary):		
D. FANVIDONIMENTAL COMPONENTS				
B. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS				
Applicable Yes □No □				
Were roadside restoration and/or wetland mitigation plans reviewed and		_		
approved by appropriate authority?		Ц		
Is there a long term environmental commitments tracking system?				
Are environmental commitments incorporated in design?				
·				
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space i	s nece	ssary):		
C. GEOLOGICAL, SOILS, & MATERIALS REPORTS AND PAVEMENT DESIG	GN - CI	hapters	510 &	520
Applicable Yes□No □				
For any State supplied material source is source approved?				

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
2. Is OSC Materials Branch approved Soil Report in the file?				
3. Is OSC Materials Branch approved Resurfacing Report in the file?				
4. Is OSC Materials Branch approved Pavement Type Determination in the file?				
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if addition	al spa	ce is n	ecessar	y):
D. GEOMETRICS - Chapters 440,620,630 & 650 Applicable Yes No			_	
Is design speed appropriate and documented in the file?				
Does vertical stopping sight distance comply with appropriate design standards?			_	
standards?	Ш			
3. Does horizontal stopping sight distance comply with appropriate design standards?				
Does horizontal curvature and rate of superelevation comply with project design speed?				
5. Are superelevation transitions in compliance with standards?				

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
6. Do lane and shoulder widths comply with standards?				
7. Do pavement cross-slopes comply with standards?				
8. Do roadway foreslopes and backslopes comply with standards?				
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space i	s nece	essary):		
F. HIGHWAY CAPACITY - Chapter 610			_	
Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐				
Was capacity analysis performed?				
2. Do improvements provide design year level of service that complies with Figure 610-1?				
3. Is traffic forcast methodology reasonable?				

REVIEW ITEMS Yes No⁽¹⁾ N/A REMARKS Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary): G. ROADSIDE SAFETY - Chapter 700 1. Is Design Clear Zone Inventory in the file? 2. Are decisions to not mitigate specific hazards documented with engineering analysis? 3. Are roadside safety items that are deferred for two years documented in the Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space is necessary): H. TRAFFIC BARRIERS - Chapter 710 Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐ Spot Checked \square Completely Checked \square 1. Do guardrail installations comply with standards? 2. Does barrier comply with Figure 700-5, Guidelines for Embankment Barrier 3. Do barrier installations comply with length of need requirements?

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
4. Are special barrier installations approved by the OSC Design Office, and is this documented in the file?				
5. Are appropriate barrier end treatment or protection provided at each barrier location?				
6. Is substandard bridge rail upgraded and is design acceptable?				
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if addition	al spa	ce is n	ecessar	y):
I. SIGNING, DELINEATION, AND ILLUMINATION - Chapters 820, 830 & 840				
Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐				
1. Does signing comply with Chapter 820?				
2. Is Bridge and Structures Office concurrence in the file for attaching sign supports to structures?	П	П	П	
3. Does delineation comply with Chapter 830?				
41.014.7.65.5				
4. Is State Traffic Engineer approval to use less than or exceeding basic illumination documented in the file?				
E. Door Illumination compless with Chapter 9402				
5. Does Illumination comply with Chapter 840?				

REVIEW ITEMS Yes No⁽¹⁾ N/A REMARKS Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary): J. SIGNALIZATION - Chapter 850 Applicable Yes No 1. Are there approved signal permits in the file? 2. Is approved preliminary signal plan in the file? Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if additional space is necessary): K. INTERSECTIONS - Chapter 910 Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐ 1. Does existing/new intersection sight distance comply with design standards and are analyses documented in the file? 2. Was appropriate design speed used to evaluate existing intersections or to design new intersections? 3. Were existing intersection skew angles evaluated in accordance with appropriate design matrix? 4. Was the appropriate recommended minimum intersection design vehicle selected for each turning movement or is there a traffic analysis showing that the selected design vehicle is appropriate?

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS			
5. Are new intersections or modifications to intersections designed to accommodate the selected design vehicle or is required encroachment justified?							
6. Are designs for new or revised intersections backed by an engineering evaluation based on a traffic analysis?							
7. Do all other geometrics for new intersections or modifications to intersections comply with design standards taper rates, roadway widths, shy, channelization, storage lengths, etc.?							
8. Is there documentation for the need and spacing and justification for the selected design vehicle for U-turn locations?							
9. Do bicycle lanes and pedestrian accommodations comply with standards?							
10. Are traffic islands designed to standards?							
L. INTERCHANGES - Chapter 940 Applicable Yes No Refer to Section K, INTERSECTIONS for review of interchange intersections							
Is there an approved new or revised access point report in the file?							
2. Is there an approved interchange plan that includes channelization in the file?							
3. Is design backed by a traffic report that includes design year level of service analyses at critical locations?							

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
4. Are all existing and planned median crossovers in accordance with the regional Master Plan for Median Crossovers, and is this documented in the file?				
5. Has documentation for new crossovers and the design data, together with a right of way print showing the opening in red, been submitted to the OSC Design Office for right of way or limited access plan approval, and is this documented in the file?				
6. Do HOV bypass lanes, shoulders, merges, and enforcement areas comply with standards?				
7. Do ramp meter locations comply with standards, and does storage capacity comply with traffic report recommendations?				
8. Do weaving lanes comply with standards?				
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if addition	al spa	ce is n	ecessar	y):
M. BRIDGES - Chapter 1120				
Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐				
Does existing or proposed bridge width comply with appropriate design standard?				
Do bridge rails not restrict horizontal and/or intersection sight distances to below standards?				

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
3. Do existing or proposed guardrail attachments and bridge connection transition sections comply with design standards?				
4. Was bridge type, size, and location (TS&L) prepared by Bridge and Structures Office?				
5. Where median is 8m or less in width, will gap be decked or netted over between parallel structures?				
6. Are all new structures and all modifications to existing structures designed by or reviewed and approved by the Bridge and Structures office, and are approvals documented in the file?				
7. Is Bridge and Structures Office concurrence to connect traffic barrier to bridge documented in the file?				
8. Is bridge deck protective treatment system designed by or reviewed and approved by the Bridge and Structures Office?				
9. Is OSC Design Office approval to install protective bridge screening in the file?				
10. Is method of attaching the protective screening to the bridge approved by the Bridge and Structures Office?				
11. Are bridge vertical clearance and bridge approach slabs standard or documented deviations in file?				
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space i	s nece	essary)	:	

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
N. HYDRAULIC DESIGN - Chapter 1210				
Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐				
Was OSC/Region Hydraulics branch contacted for technical assistance				
when implementing stormwater management practices established by local				
governments?				
2. Was a safety rest area hydraulic report accomplished and reviewed and	_			
approved by the OSC/Region Hydraulics Branch?	ш	Ш		
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if addition	al sna	ce is ne	ecessar	v):
The viewer of additional plan review items follow (ase attachments in addition	iai spa	CC 13 110	cocooui	y)·
O. ACCESS CONTROL & FENCING - Chapters 1420 & 1460				
Applicable Yes ☐ No ☐			_	
Is State Design Engineer approval to defer access control documented in				
the file?				
O If limited access is not involved and in access on a constant and and				
2. If limited access is not implemented, is access management standards implemented?		П	П	
implemented:	ш	ш	ш	
3. Is justification documented in the file for not installing access control				
fencing?				
Additional general review comments (use attachments if additional space in	s nece	essary):	:	

REVIEW ITEMS	Yes	No ⁽¹⁾	N/A	REMARKS
P. OTHER ITEMS AS APPLICABLE				
Do bicycle paths comply with standards?				
2. Do pedestrian trails comply with standards?				
3. Are the requirements of Chapter 1140 followed in the design of noise barriers, and is the documentation in the file?				
4. Does the transit benefit facility design comply with Chapter 1060?				
5. Does the weigh station design comply with Chapter 1040?				
6. Are climbing lanes, passing lanes, and/or slow moving vehicle turnouts analyses documented in the file?				
7. Do designs for proposed climbing lanes, passing lanes, and/or slow moving vehicle turnouts comply with Chapter 1010?				
8. Are experimental feature approvals and approved work plans in the file?				
Reviewer's additional plan review items follow (use attachments if addition	nal spa	ce is n	ecessar	у):